

REMARKS

This Reply is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated October 16, 2008. Claims 1, 3, 6-14, 17-33, 35, 37-41, 44-58, 61-68, and 71-88 remain present this application. Claims 2, 4, 5, 15, 16, 34, 36, 42, 43, 59, 60, 69, 70, and 89-91 were previously canceled. In the present Office Action: claims 29-32, 53-56, and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 12-14 [sic?: 13, 14], 17-20, 22-33, 35, 37, 41, 44-47, 49-58, 61, 62, 67, 68, 71, 72, 74-81, and 83-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,943,402 (hereinafter “Hamel”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,243 (hereinafter “Valco”); claims 8-10, 12, 38, 40 and 63-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamel in view of Valco and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,906 (hereinafter “Parsons”); and claims 11, 21, 39, 48, and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamel in view of Valco and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,736 (hereinafter “Haddock”).

Applicants note that claim 59, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, was previously canceled. Applicants have amended claims 29 and 53 (in addition to claim 67, which was not rejected) to address the rejection of claims 29-32 and 53-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In rejecting Applicants’ prior argument, the Office Action (at page 2) stated “Applicant contends that the prior art of record does not disclose creating a bookmarked message from the voicemail message and the bookmarks, however this newly added limitation is found in Hamel (see 110 and 120a of Fig. 2D).” Applicants believe that the Examiner has misunderstood Applicants’ prior arguments. More specifically, Applicants again submit that Applicants’ independent claims 1, 33, and 57 are directed to a voice mail message that has a corresponding bookmarked message that includes multiple bookmarks, at least two of which are used to mark respective segments (of the voice mail message) as having degrees of importance (that are different for some of the respective segments). Applicants note that while Hamel does disclose inserting multiple acoustic tones into voice messages, Hamel does not teach or suggest acoustic tones that have an associated degree of importance (as is acknowledged by the Examiner at page 3, i.e., “Hamel is silent on disclosing the bookmarks correspond to topics and segments having different ones of the degrees of importance.”). With respect to Valco, Applicants respectfully submit that Valco (see, for example, column 12, lines 55-59), in pertinent part, merely discloses

that a voice message (as contrasted with bookmarks within a voice message) may be marked as urgent or private. This does not teach or suggest assigning bookmarks (within a bookmarked message) different degrees of importance. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a method, a system, or a computer-readable medium that creates (or is configured to create) a bookmarked message (from a voice mail message) that includes multiple bookmarks, at least two of which are used to mark respective segments (of the voice mail message) as having degrees of importance (that are different for some of the respective segments). In sum, neither Hamel, alone or in combination with Valco, Haddock, and/or Parsons, teaches or suggests bookmarks that have degrees of importance.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' independent claims 1, 33, and 57 are allowable over the applied art of record, alone or in combination. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3, 6-14, 17-32, 35, 37-41, 44-56, 58, 61-68, and 71-88 are also allowable for at least the reason that the claims depend on allowable claims.

Prior to action on this Reply, Applicants request an additional telephone interview with the Examiner. The undersigned attorney may be reached at (512) 617-5521.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Long

Reg. No. 42,808

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Highway, Ste. 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

Telephone (512) 617-5521

Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)